

<b>Ex Parte Reexamination Interview Summary</b>	Control No.	<b>Patent Under Re-examination</b>
	09/902,109	MIYAKE ET AL.
	Examiner Peter D. Mulcahy	Art Unit 1713

All participants (USPTO personnel, patent owner, patent owner's representative):

- (1) Peter D. Mulcahy (3) \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) Mr. Bailey (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 28 January 2004

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
 c) Personal (copy given to: 1) patent owner 2) patent owner's representative)

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.  
 Any other agreement(s) are set forth below under "Description of the general nature of what was agreed to..."

Claim(s) discussed: 1,2,5 and 9.

Identification of prior art discussed: Of record.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:  
See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims patentable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims patentable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE PATENT OWNER'S STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP § 2281). IF A RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION HAS ALREADY BEEN FILED, THEN PATENT OWNER IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO PROVIDE THE MANDATORY STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (37 CFR 1.560(b)). THE REQUIREMENT FOR PATENT OWNER'S STATEMENT CAN NOT BE WAIVED. EXTENSIONS OF TIME ARE GOVERNED BY 37 CFR 1.550(c).

**PETER D. MULCAHY  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

cc: Requester (if third party requester)

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants pointed out that the stabilizer compounds are to be used in butadiene polymer compositions. The electronic system of the butadiene polymer is different from the electronic systems of the vinylpolymer shown in the prior art. As such one would not find the claimed invention obvious. The examiner maintains that the breadth of the claims is not supported by the record. Applicants should consider claims narrowed to species of stabilizer and a further showing of unexpected results.

The amendment to the specification filed 10/03/03 has been entered..